

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 52, 66, 67 under 35 USC section 112 1st Paragraph

Claim 52 has been cancelled. Claims 66 and 72 have been amended to state that the video data that may be searched is the video data previously stored on the first storage medium.

Rejection of claims 44, 49 under 35 USC section 112 2nd Paragraph

Claim 44 has been amended to change the term "the high-capacity storage media" to memory device providing proper antecedence.

Claim 49 has been amended to change the term "the high-capacity storage media" to memory providing proper antecedence.

Rejection of claims 8-15, 25-32, 34-36, 41-42, 44-46, 49-51, 55-57, 60-61, and 75-76 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Boerger (US 4,650,929)

The Boerger reference teaches a communication system for video conferencing. The Boerger reference discloses the use of a central station that is linked with terminals. The terminals are described at column 2 lines 60-65 as including "a camera, a single monitor, and the usual microphone-loudspeaker means, i.e. a minimum of terminal equipment, and also the broad-band go and return channels needed in any case for any videoconference". The Boerger reference states that the inventive contribution is that the central station requires expenditure for the equipment of the videoconference system while the terminals do not.

The examiner states in the office action that the Boerger reference discloses: "displaying at least certain of the digitized images in separate windows on a personal computer based display

device, using a first set of temporal and spatial parameters associated with each image in each window (figs. 8-10, col. 4, ln. 6-9, 37-49, col. 7, ln. 29-33 and col. 8, ln. 62-64); converting one or more of the video source images into a data storage format using a second set of temporal and spatial parameters associated with each image; and simultaneously storing the converted images in a memory device (fig. 2, el. 5-6, col. 3, ln. 44-51; col. 7, ln. 12-15 and ln. 37-43).”

The passage in column 3 lines 44-51 states:” According to the invention central stations can be equipped with any number of picture storage units and multiplexers but at least with a number needed for a single videoconference. With a sufficient number, the equipment may then be interconnected in the central station to groups for every one of the conferences, with a set of corresponding control devices for each of these groups.” The passage at column 7 lines 12-17 states: “This equipment is assigned to the participating locations 25 always for the duration of a video conference and it substantially comprises large picture storages 5 and small picture storages 6 as well as multiplexers (MUX) 7 for the outgoing video sink or reception signals. “ The passage at column 8 lines 36-41 states:” if a plurality of participants is to be shown which are all at the same terminal or location, since in such an instance only the horizontal margins are omitted. Still another large picture 46(w) having the width and height dimensions $\frac{3}{5}d$ and $\frac{2}{5}d$ has all the margins omitted.”

None of the passages indicated above teaches a digital monitoring and recording system or method that includes displaying digitized images in separate windows using a first set of temporal and spatial parameters and converting the video source images into a data storage format using a second set of temporal and spatial parameters associated with each image; and

storing the converted images. Claims 8, 12, 25 and 29 are all independent claims including the limitation of a first set of temporal and spatial parameters for displaying the video image and a second set of temporal and spatial parameters for storing the video image. Therefore, the Boerger reference does not teach each and every limitation of Claims 8, 12, 25 and 29. (See MPEP section 2131) Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested. Similarly dependant claims 9-11, 13-14, and 26-28, are also not anticipated.

Claims 15 and 17 include the limitation of varying the dimensions and the rate at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands. The examiner in the office action refers to column 2 lines 39-50 for the disclosure of this step. Column 2 lines 39-50 states: "A central station is connected to all of the participant terminals and includes means for receiving source signals from and transmitting sink or received signals to all the participant terminals as well as storage units for storing in each case a large size picture and at least one small coarse grained picture for each active participant location or terminal, the central station having a programmed processor for receiving control signals from the participant terminals to control the display assembly and split screen of large and small or coarse pictures at the participant terminals individually." There is no disclosure of varying the storage parameters such as the dimensions and rate in the passage presented above. Therefore, the Boerger reference does not teach each and every limitation of Claims 15 and 17. (See MPEP section 2131) Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested. Similarly dependant claim 16 is also not anticipated.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 17-18, 33, 38, 43, 47, 52-54, 62-65, 67-71, and 73-74 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boerger (US 4,650,929) in view of Lobodzinski (5,619,995)

At the outset it is noted that neither the Boerger reference nor the Lobodzinski reference teaches a video monitoring and storage system that includes varying the dimensions and the rate at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands.

The Boerger reference was discussed above and is not repeated here. The Lobodzinski reference teaches a motion video transformation system and method for displaying, archiving and analyzing medical imaging procedures. The examiner only cites the Lobodzinski reference for the teaching of using two different types of storage media. Claims 1 and 17 include the limitation of varying the dimensions and the rate at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands.

The combination of the Boerger and Lobodzinski references does not teach or disclose varying the dimensions and the rate at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands. To establish prima facie obviousness all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (see MPEP section 2143.03) As there is no disclosure in the combination of references of varying the dimensions and the rate at which an image is stored, applicant's attorney respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Similarly dependant claims 2-7, 18, 33, 38, 43, 47, 52-54, 62-65, 67-71, and 73-74 are also not obvious.

Rejection of Claim 3 under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boerger (US 4,650,929) in view of Lobodzinski (5,619,995) and further in view of Toyoshima

The Boerger and Lobodzinski references were discussed above and are not repeated here. The examiner has added the Toyoshima reference for the teaching of digital compression of an

image at the location of the camera. As stated above there is no teaching in the combination of Boerger and Lobodzinski of varying the dimensions and the rate at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands. The addition of the Toyoshima reference does not cure this deficiency in the prior art including the rate and size at which a particular image is stored in accordance with one of the externally derived commands. To establish prima facie obviousness all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (see MPEP section 2143.03) As there is no disclosure in the combination of references of varying the dimensions and the rate at which an image is stored, applicant's attorney respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

It is argued that the present amendment places all of the claims in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

Dated: February 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Kevin S. MacKenzie/
Kevin S. MacKenzie
Registration No.: 45,639
GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.
2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330
Post Office Box 7021
Troy, Michigan 48007-7021
(248) 647-6000
(248) 647-5210 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant